nts for Home Rulers: No. 4.

DISCONTENT IN INDIA

BY

DADABHAI NAOROJI

REPRINTED FROM THE WELBY

C MISSION REPORT OF 1897

THE HOME RULE BOOK SHOP

10, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

One Anna.

HELP THE CAUSE OF HOME RULE

A first instalment of R wa ven from the profits to the Ho ule League, Madras, in August, 7.

THE CAUSES OF DISCONTENT IN INDIA.

[We print below the Text of a memorandum placed before the Welby Commission by the late Mr. Dadabhoi Naoroji,]

Nobody can more appreciate the benefits of the British connection than I do—Education in particular, appreciation of, and desire for, British Political institutions, law and order, freedom of speech and public meeting, and several important reforms. All these are the glory of England and gratitude of India. I am most sincerely ready to accord my gratitude for any benefit which Britain can rightly claim.

But, while looking at one side, justice demands that we look at the other side also. And the main object of this Commission is to see the other side of the system of the administration and management of expenditure and right apportionment.

It must be remembered that while education and law and order have been beneficial to the Indians of British India they were also most essential to the very existance of the British in India. Only that while the benefits have been to both Britain and British India, the cost has been all exacted from the Indians.

The British Empire in India is built up entirely with the money of India, and, in great measure, by the blood of India. Besides this, hundreds of millions, or more probably, several thousands of millions (besides what is consumed in India itself by Europeans and their careers of life) of money, which Britain has unceasingly and ever increasingly, drawn from British

Indians and is still drawing, had materially helped to make Britain the greatest, the richest, and most glorious country in the world—benefitting her meterial condition so much that, even when there is a general and loud cry of depression in agriculture, etc., the Chancellor of the Exchequer is rejoicing that his income tax is marvellously increasing; while British India in its turn is reduced to "extreme poverty" and helotry.

Will the India Office be good enough to give me a Return of the enormous wealth which Britain has drawn out of India during the past century and a half, calculated with ordinary British commercial 5 per cent compound interest, leave alone the 9 per cent. ordinary commercial rate of interest of British India? What a tale will that Return tell! The India Office must have all the records of the India House as well as its own.

I give a few figures that are available to me. The best test of this drain from British India is (I) that portion of produce exported out of British India for which nothing whatever has returned to her in any shape, either of merchandise or treasure; (2) the profits of her whole exports which she never got. (3) that portion of the exports which belongs to the Native States aud which the Native States get back, with their due profits, which are included in the total imports, and are therefore not included in the "net exports." For No. (I) I have the following authoritative figures for only 45 years (1849-50 to 1894-5, "Statistical Abstract of British India," No. 30, 1895, p. 299). Will the India Office supply previous figures?

This table shows that British India sent out or exported, of her produce to the extent of £526,740,000, for which she has not received back a single farthing's worth of any kind of material return. Besides this loss

or drain of actual produce, there is (2) the further drain of the profits on an export of £ 2,851,000,000 which. taken at only 10 per cent, will be another £ 285,000,000 which British India has not received—subject to the deduction of portion of (No. 3) viz., the profits of the Native States. To this has to be added the profits which Indian Foreigners (i.e., the capitalists of Native States) make in British India, and carry away to their own States. Freight and marine insurances premiums have to be taken into account, for whether for exports from or imports into, India, these items are always paid in England. It is necessary to know how these two items are dealt with in the Returns of the so-called trade of British India. In ordinary circumstances, one may not complain if a foreigner came and made his profits on a fair aud equal footing with the people of British India. But British India is not allowed such fair and equal footing.

First, the unrighteous and despotic system of Government prevents British India from enjoying its own produce or resources, and renders it capital-less and helpless. Then, foreign capitalists come in and complete the disaster, sinking the people to the condition of their hewers of wood and drawers of water. The enormous resources of India are all at the disposal and command of these foreigners.

In understanding correctly the tables to which I refer, it must be borne in mind that all the loans made to India form a part of the imports, aud are already paid for and included in that portion of the exports which is equal to the total imports, the "net exports" in the table being, after allowing for all imports, including loans. Otherwise, if these loans were deducted from the imports, the "net exports"

will be so much larger. The position of the exploitation by the foreign capitalists is still worse than I have already represented. Not only do they exploit and make profits with their own capital, but they draw even their capital from the taxation of the poor people themselves. The following words of Sir James Westland in the telegram of the *Times* of 18th December last will explain what I mean.

"Sir. J. Westland then explained how closely connected the Money Market of India was with the Government balances, almost all the available capital employed in commerce practically being in those balances. A crore and a half which under normal conditions would have been at headquarters in Calcutta and Bombay had been placed at the disposal of the mercantile community for trading purposes."

The Bank of Bengal and Chamber of Commerce pressed the Government to take up the question of the paper currency reserve as urgently as possible, and pass a Bill without delay to afford relief to commerce. So, the European merchants, bankers, etc., may have Indian taxes at their disposal, the profits of which they may take away to their own country! The poor wretched taxpayers must not only find money for an unrighteous system of Government expenditure but must also supply capital to exploit their own resources.

The reference to this Commission is to enquire into expenditure and apportionment. I am fully convinced and my representations fully prove it, that if the system of the administration and management of expenditure and the apportionment were based on principles of righteousness, honesty, honour, and unselfishness, the political peculiarties of India are such as would produce an abiding attachment, and connection between the two countries which will not merely be of much benefit to

British India but of vastly more benefit to the British themselves than at present. Hence, my extreme desire that the connexion should continue and I can say truly that, in a spirit of loyalty both to India and to the British Empire. I feel it therefore my duty (though a painful one) to point out candidly the causes which, in my opinion, have weakened, and are weakening more and more, this connexion, and unless checked, threaten to destroy it.

I. The un-English, autocratic and despotic system of administration, under which the Indian people are not given the slightest voice in the management of their own expenditure. It is not creditable to the British character that they should refuse to a loyal and law-abiding people that voice in their own affairs which they value so much for themselves.

II. The unrighteous "bleeding" of India, under which the masses have been reduced to such "extreme poverty" that the failure of one harvest causes millions upon millions to die from hunger, and scores of millions are living on "scanty subsistence." What Oriental despotism or Russian despotism in Russia can produce a more deplorable result ?.

III. The breach or evasion by subterfuges of solemn pledges and proclamations, issued by her Majesty and the British nation, and the flouting of such Acts and Resolutions of Parliament, as are favourable to Indians. Such proceedings destroy the confidence of the Indian people in the justice of British rule. To sum up, these and other errors in administration have had the effect of inflicting upon India the triple evil of depriving the people of Wealth, Work, and Wisdom, and making the British Indians, as the ultimate result "extremely poor", unemployed (their services which are their property in their own country, being plundered

from them) and degradingly deteriorated and debassed, crushing out of them their very humanhood.

Before I proceed further, let me clear up a strange confusion of ideas about prosperous British India and poverty-stricken British India. This confusion of ideas arises from this circumstance. My remarks are for British India only.

In reality there are two Indias—one the prosperous, the other poverty-stricken.

I. The prosperous India is the India of the British and other foreigners. They exploit India as officials, non-officials, capitalists, in a variety of ways, and carry away enormous wealth to their own country. To them India is, of course, rich and prosperous. The more they can carry away, the richer and more prosperous India is to them. These British and other foreigners cannot understand and realise why India can be called "extremely poor," when they can make their life carrers, they can draw so much wealth from it and enrich their own country. It seldom occurs to them, if at all, what all that means to the Indians themselves.

(2) The second India is the India of the Indians—the poverty-stricken India. This India. "bled" and exploited in every way of their wealth, of their services, of their land, labour, and all resources by the foreigners, helpless and voiceless, governed by the arbitrary law and arguments of force, and with injustice and unrighteousness—this India of the Indians becomes the "poorest' country in the world, after one hunderd and fifty years of British Rule, to the disgrace of the British name. The greater the drain the greater the impoverishment-resulting in all the scourges of war, famine and pestilence. Lord Salisbury's words face us at every turm, "Injustice will bring down the mightiest to ruin." If this distinction of the "prosperous India" of the

slave-holders and the "poverty-stricken India" of the slaves be carefully borne in mind, a great deal of the controversy on this point will be saved. Britain can, by a righteous system, make both Indias prosperous. The great pity is that the Indian authorities do not or would not see it. They are blinded by selfishness—to find careers for "our boys."

To any appeals the ears of the British Indian authorities are deaf. The only thing that an Indian can do is to appeal to the British people. I must explain. I have no complaint against the British people. The Sovereign, the British people, and Parliament have all in one direction done their duty by laying down the true and righteous principles of dealing with India. But their desires and biddings are made futile by their servants, the Indian authorities, in both countries. For these reasons my only resource is to appeal to the British people and to this Commission to cause the order of her Majesty and of Parliament to be carried out.

It is not needful for me to repeat my views, which I have given in my previous representations, which have been in the hands of the Commission from nine to fifteen months. and in which I have dealt with both the injustice and the evils, and the remedy of the present system of expenditure and apportionement, and it remains for the Commission to cross-examine me on all the six representations.

I would add here a few more remarks arising from some of the evidence and other circumstances.

Indians are repeatedly told, and in this Commission several times, that Indians are partners in the British Empire and must share the burdens of the Empire. Then I propose a simple test. For instance, supposing that the expenditure of the total Navy of the Empire,

is, say £ 30,000,000, and as partners in the Empire you ask British India to pay £ 10,000,000, more or less: British India, as partner, would be ready to pay, and therefore, as partner, must have her share in the employment of British Indians and in every other benefit of the services to the extent of her contribution. Take the Army. Suppose the expenditure of the total Army of the Empire is, say, £ 40,000,000. Now, you may ask £ 20,000,000, or more or less, to be contributed by British India. Then, as partners, India must claim, and must have, every employment and benefit of that service to the extent of her contribution. If, on the other hand, you force the helpless and voiceless British India to pay, but not to receive a return to the extent of the payment, then your treatment is the unrighteous wicked treatment of the slave-master over British India as a slave. In short, if British India is to be treated as a partner in the Empire, it must follow that to whatever extent (be it a farthing or a hundred millions) British India contributes to the expenses of any department, to that extent the British Indians must have a share in the services and benefits of that department-whether civil, military, naval or any other; then only will British India be the "intergal part" of, or partner, in, the Empire. If there be honour and righteousness on the side of the British, then this is the right solution of the rights and duties of British India and of both the references to this Commission. Then will the Empire become a true Empire with an honest partnership, and not a false Empire and an untrue partnership. This is the main, principal question the Commission has to clear up. This will fully show the true nature and solution of both the expenditure and apportionment. I appeal to the British people. When I have been personally observing, during

forty years, how the British people are always on the side of the helpless and the oppressed, how, at present, they are exerting every nerve, and lavishing money, to save the thousands of Armenians, then I cannot believe that the same people will refuse to see into the system of expenditure adopted by their own servants, by which not merely some thousands or hundred thousands suffer, but by which millions of their own fellow-subjects perish in a drought, and scores of millions live underfed, on scanty subsistence, from one end of the year to the other. The so-called Famine Relief Fund is nothing more or less than a mere subterfuge of taxing the starving to save the dying. This fund does not rain from heaven, nor does the British Exchequer give it. If the Government spend say £. 5 000,000, on the present famine, they will simply squeeze it out of the poverty-stricken surviving taxpayers, who would in turn become the victims of the next drought.

The British people stand charged with the blood of the perishing millions and the starvation of scores of millions, not because they desire so, but because the authorities to whom they have committed the trust betray that trust and administer expenditure in a manner based upon selfishness and political hypocrisy, and most disastrous to the people. There is an Indian saying: "Pray strike on the back, but don't strike on the belly."

Under the Native despot the people keep and enjoy what they produce, though at times they suffer some violence on the back. Under the British Indian despot the man is at peace, there is no violence; his substance is drained away, unseen, peaceably and subtly—he starves in peace and perishes in peace, with law and order; I wonder how the English people would like such a fate !. I say, therefore, to the British peple to

by all means help the poor Armenians but, I appeal to you to look home also and save the hundreds of millions of your own fellow-subjects, from whom you have taken thousands of millions of wealth,and obtained also your Indian Empire, entirely at their cost and mainly with their blood, with great careers for thousands of yourselves at our cost and destruction.

The great question is not merely how to meet a famine when it occurs—by taxing the poor people—but how to prevent the occurences of the famine. As long as the present unrighteous system will prevail there will be no end of the scourges of India. We are thankful for the benefit of the knowledge of "western civilisation." But what we need is the deeds of Western righteousness and honour to stop the famine, and to advance the prosperity of both countries. With relation to the present famine, I have to make one or two remarks.

For the famine of 1878, the British help amounted to the magnificent sum of about, I think, £ 700,000, On the other hand, the British public have to remember that they have been drawiug, by the unrighteous system of the authorities, every year 30 to 40, or more times, £ 700,000 from poor India; or say from the time of the last famine they have drawn from India, and added to their own wealth some £400,000,000 or more (leaving alone what they have been draining for a century and a half), and if they now give even £ 4,000,000 or £ 5,000,000 in the present distress, it will be but 1 to 2 per cent of what they have obtained from India during the last eighteen years. It is a duty of the British people to give in abundance from the great, great, abundance they have received. As far as the poor people of India are concerned, they will receive whatever you would give with deep gratitude in their dire extremity.

The second fact is, what the British people will readily and early give will have a double blessing. They will, in the first instance, save so many lives and in the next place save the poor survivors from so much taxation, which otherwise the Government would exact every farthing of, for whatever Government would spend from the revenue. The novel, loud and vain boast of the Government of India having resources to meet the famine simply means this, that every farthing of the whole famine expenditure (bad or good) by the Government, will be, by their despotic power, sqeezed out of the wretched people themselves by taxation in which they have not the slightest voice. Never was there a false trumpet blown than the boast of the Government to be able to cope with the famine, "with its own resources." Of course, the resources of despotism are inexhaustable,for who can prevent it from taxing as much as it likes ?. It is a wonder to me that they do not feel ashamed of talking of "their own resources," when it all means so much more squeezing of a squeezed and helpless people. And especially when they not only, Shylock-like, take the whole pound of their large salaries, but also the ounce of blood of their illegal and immoral exchange compensation.

Amongst the most favourite excuses of the Anglo Indians is, that the extreme poverty of the people and the disasters of famines are owing to increase of population. I have dealt with this subject in my third representation, and I want to say a few words more. The point to which I want to draw attention here is, that Anglo Indians, official or non-official of every kind are not at all competant to pronounce any judgment upon the cause of poverty and disasters of famines. For, they themselves are the accused, as the cause of all the evils, and they cannot be judges in it. Their

own deep, interest is concerned in it. Let them withdraw their hand from India's throat, and then see whether the increase in population is not an addition to its strength and production instead of British-made famines and poverty. Then it will also be seen that the hundreds of millions of British India, instead of being afflicted with all sorts of evils, will become your best customers and give you a true trade—more than your present trade with the whole world.

I now refer to a strange sign of the times. By an irony of fate, and as an indication of the future, and after 150 years of British connection and rule, Russia—to whom the Anglo Indians always point as a threat—offers generous sympathy and aid to starving and dying British subjects. I do not pretend to know Russia's mind; but any one can see what the effect of this, aided by the emissaires, might be on India. "See how kind and generous the Russians are and give us help". It will be further pointed out, "see, not only are the Russians sympathetic with you, but their great Emperor himself has published in his book, words of condemnation of the rules which suck away your life-blood". The *Times* of 10th December last, in its leader on the Russo-Chinese Treaty says:—"Russia, we may be sure, will pursue her own policy and promote her own interests". "Russia is bent upon developing her vast Asiatic Empire." But the blind Indian authorities would not see that England would not have any chance to hold her own in India without the true (not liployal) attachment of the Indian people. Is it possible for any sane man to think that any one nation can hold another in slavery and yet except loyal devotion and attachment from it? It is not nature, not human nature. It has never happened and will never happen. Righteousness alone can exalt and be enduring. Events

are moving fast. The time is come when the question must be speedily answered, whether India is to be a real partner and and strength to England, or a slave and a weakness to England—as it has hitherto been. How much of the future destiny of the British Empire and India depends upon this, a man of an unbiassed mind can think for himself. India forms five-sixths of the population of the British Empire.

I put one question, which I have often put, and which is always ignored or evaded. Suppose the British people were subjected to the same despotic treatment of expenditure by some foreign people, as India is by the British Indian authorities, would the British people stand it a single day without rebelling against it? No, certainly not, and yet, can the British people think it righteous and just to treat the Indians as the Indian authorities do—as mere helpless and voiceless slaves. Macaulay has truly said that:

> "That would indeed be a doting wisdom which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would make it a useless and costly dependency which would keep a hundred millions (now 225,000,000) from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves.

The question of remedy I have already dealt with in my fifth representation, and I would not have said more here. But as the *Times* of 8th December last, in its article on "Indian Affairs," confirms, by actual facts and events, the wisdom and statesmanship of Lord Salisbury and Iddesleigh, in their one great work of righteous and wise policy, I desire to quote a few words, Fortunately, it is the very Mysore State to which this righteous and wise act was done, The *Times* says:—

"The account which Sir Sheshadri Iyer rendered to it of his last years stewardship is one of increasing revenue, reduced taxation, expenditure firmly kept in hand, reproductive public works, and a large expansion of cultivation, of mining and of industrial undertakings. The result is a surplus which goes to swell the previous accumulation from the same source."

Can the present system of British administration and management of the expenditure ever produce such results? Never. A dozen Gladstones will not succeed.

Continuous and increasing "bleeding" can only reduce strenth and kill. The *Times*' article concludes with the words:—

"A narrative such as Sir Sheshadri Iyer was able to make to the Representative Assembly of Mysors makes us realise the growth of capital in the Native States, and opens up new prospects of industrial undertakings and railway constructions in India on a silver basis."

Can this be said of British India? No. I shall quote one other extract.

"One of the Bombay Chiefs, after some experience of railway making in his own and adjoining territories, struck out a new departure at the beginning of the present year. He conceived the idea of public loans to be issued for railway construction by one Feudatory Prince to another on the guarantee of the revenues of the borrowing State. The first transaction in which this principle is completedly carried out was a loan of two million rupees by H. H. Sir Bhagvat Sinhjit

the ruler of Gondal, to H. H. Jasvan, Sinhji, the ruler of Jamnagar, cn the 8th of January 1896."

Now, anybody who knows Jamnagar, knows that with ordinary good management it will not be long before that State is in a position to pay off its debts, just as the good management of Mysore was able to do, and the good management of Gondal has enabled its ruler to lend such an amount. This loan by Gondal, it must be remembered, is in addition to building its own railway in its own territory from its own revenue, without any loan, or help or additional taxation.

No one can rejoice more than myself that Native States which adopt ordinary good management go on increasing in prosperity in strong contrast with the system of British management of expenditure. This is fully confirmatory of the words of Lords Salisbury and Iddesleigh as to what should be done for British India's prosperity. I have quoted these words in my fifth representation. And some of them are worth quoting here once more. Lord Salisbury said —

> "The general concurence of opinion of those who know India best is that a number of well-governed small Native States are in the highest degree advantageous to the development of the political and moral conditiou of the people of India. But I think the existence of a well-governed Native State is a real benefit, not only to the stability of our rule, but because more than anything it raises the selfrespect of the Natives, and forms an ideal to which the popular feeling can aspire."

Referring to the several phases of the British Rule, he sums up that they produce an amount of inefficiency which, when reinforced by natural causes and circum-

stances, creates a terrible amount of misery. It might also be noted that the richest provinces and most important seaports are all British. So the people of British India should be much more prosperous than those living in the inferior districts left to Native Chiefs. Yet in British India is the "terrible amount of misery" after a rule of 150 years by the most highly-trumpted and most highly paid services. Lord Iddesleigh not only agreed with the best course innovated by Lord Salisbury, but actually put it fuily into operation with the confidence that the course he took would "at once afford a guarantee for the good government of the people, and for the security of British rights and interests." And after an experience of fifteen years, the writer in the Times is able to express such bighly favourable opinion as I have quoted above.

Another favourite argument of some Anglo-Indians is the want of capacity of the Indians. In the evidence last year this was referred to once or twice. There is a paper of mine in the Journals of the East India Association on that subject, but I do not want to trouble the Commission with it. It is the old trick of the tyrant not to give you the opportunity of fair trial, andto condemn you off-hand as incapable. The Indians are put to the iniquitous handicap to come over to this conntry for the civil services in their own country, and from the Army and Navy they are entirely excluded from the Commission rauks; and all this in complete violation of the most sacred pledges and Acts of Parliament. I will, not, however, trouble the Commission with any further remarks on this all-important subject. It is enough for me to put before the Commission the article in the *Times* of 5th October last on Indian Affairs as the latest honest expression of a well-known Anglo-Indian, as there have been many already from

time to time from other Anglo-Indians. I put this article as an appendix.

In question 13,353, Lord Wolseley said "there never was an India until we made it"; and in question 12,796, Sir Ralph Knex says, "My own view is that England has made India what she is." I acknowledge the correctness of these statements, viz., an India to be exploited by foreigners, and the most wretched the poorest, the helpless, without the slightest voice in her own expenditure, perishing by millions in a drought and starving by scores of millions; in short, "bleeding" at every pore and a helotry for England. It is not England of the English people who have made India what she is. It is the British Indian authorities who have made her what she is.

And now I shall give some account of the process by which this deplorable result was begun to be achieved. I give the character of the process in authoritative words—words of the Court of Directors, the Bengal Government, and Lord Clive—disintered and exposed by the Committee of 1772.

First, I shall give a few words of the Court of Directors:—

> "A scene of most cruel oppression" (8/2/1764) "That they have been guilty of violating treaties, of great oppression, and a combination to enrich themselves" (Court of Directors' Letter, 26/4/1765). "The infidelity, rapaciousness, and misbehaviour of our servants in general." "Every Englishman throughout the country.........exercising his power to the oppression of the helpless Native." "We have the strongest sense of the deplorable state......from the corruption and rapacity of our servants' and the

universal depravity of manners throughout the settlement", "by a scene of the most tyrannic and oppressive conduct that ever was known in any age or country." (17/5/1766.)

Now a few words of Lord Clive and Bengal Letters:—

"Rapacity and luxury." "It is no wonder that the lust of riches should readily embrace the proferred means of its gratification, or that the instruments of your power should avail themselves of their authority, and proceed even to extortion in those cases where simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity." "Luxury, corruption, avarice, and rapacity" "to stem that torrent of luxury, corruption, and licentiousness" "the depravity of the Settlement", "shameful oppression and flagrant corruption" grievous exactions and oppressions." The "most flagrant oppressions by members of the Board." "An administration so notoriously corrupt and meanly venal throughout every department," "which, if required into, will produce discoveries, which cannot bear the light. But may bring disgrace upon this nation, and at the same time blast the reputation of great and good families."

Such were the first relations between England and India, and the manner in which India was made what she is.

Change came—corruption and oppression were replaced by high salaries. It is so easy and agreeable

to give one's own countrymen high salaries at other people's expense—the drain remains going on heavier nd heavier. What the drain in the last century was generally estimated at—something like three or five millions a year—has now become, perhaps, ten times as much. Would the India Office be good enough to give a correct statement?

Adding insult to injury, the Indians have often flaunted in their face the loans made to them, which are perhaps not one-twentieth of what is taken away from the wretched country, and which further drains the country in the shape of profits and interest. And the capitalists also are supposed to benefit us by using us as hewers of wood and drawers of water, and taking away from the country the profits of the resources of that country, and thus we lose our own wealth, service and experience, helplessly; and yet we are told by some we are getting immensely prosperous. May the British people never meet our fate!

After I had finished the above, I attended the meeting at the Mansion House. I do not in any way blame the speakers; but what a humiliating confession it was about the treatment of India by England. The only wonder is that those who made this confession did not seem to be conscious of its humiliation and unrighteousness. On the contrary, they took it with a complacency as if it was a merit of the Indian authorites. But Nature spoke the truth of the great wrong through them. Here is a people, who if they pride themselves—and justly pride-upon anything, it is their love of liberty, their determination to submit to no despotic master, who beheaded one king banished another to preserve and maintain their Government, with the voice of the people themselves, who sing that Britain shall never be a slave, whose fundamental boast is that they

regard "taxation without representation is tyranny," and that they would resist any such tyranny to a man. These people, it is confessed from a platform in the very centre of the struggle for liberty, proclaimed with a naivete and unctuousness that they deliberately in India deprived the hundreds of millions of people of this very right of humanhood for which they are so proud for themselves, that they reduced the people of India from humanhood to beasts of burden, depriving them of every voice whatsoever in their own affairs, and that they deliberately chose to govern them as the worst despots—the foreign despots for whom Macaulay has said that "the heaviest of all yokes is the yoke of the stranger." And it is this yoke of the worst despotism they imposed upon India, with all its most horrible evils of exploitation and all the scourges of this world. A Briton would not be a slave, but he would make hundreds of millions of others his slaves!—the greatest crime that any one nation can commit against another. And yet these Anglo-Indians are so callous to their own British instincts and character, that they proclaimed from the platform, with every complacency, that they had deliberately committed the unhumanising wrong, without feeling the least blush of shame, and to the disgrace and humiliation of their own nation, the British people, though the British people never desired such un-English unrighteousness towards the people of India; on the contrary, they always desired and proclaimed, by the most solemn pledges and Acts of Parliament that the Indians shall be British citizens, with all the rights and duties of British citizenship, exactly like those which the British people themselves enjoy. Never was there a more condemnatory confession than in those speeches that with the results of the terrible famine and plague they were bringing out more and

more the bitter fruits of their unrighteous system in the administration of expenditure in the deaths of millions by famine and in the starvation of scores of millions.

The other day an Anglo-Indian military officer, talking about the immigration of the persecuted Jews in this country held forth with the greatest indignation why these wretched Jews should come to this country and deprive our poor workingmen of their bread. Little did he think at the time that he himself was an immigrant forced upon the Indian people by a despotic rule, and was depriving them, not of the bread of one person, but perhaps of hundreds, or thousands, of the poor workingmen of India. I felt thankful from the bottom of my heart to the Lord Mayor for that meeting. It brought out two things—a satisfactory assurance to the Indian people that the British people are feeling for their distress, and are willing to help; and a lesson to the British people which they ought to take to heart, and for which they should do their duty, that their servants have deliberately adopted an un-English and unrighteous course, and deprived hundreds of millions of human beings of the very thing which the British people value most above all things in the world—their own voice in their own affairs, their highest glory above all other nationalities in the world. They call us fellow-citizens, and they must make their word a reality, instead of what it is at present an untruth and a romance—simply a relationship of slave-holder and slave.

Vedam & Co., Printers, Madras.